

REMARKS

The present amendment is prepared in accordance with the new revised requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.121. A complete listing of all the claims in the application is shown above showing the status of each claim. For current amendments, inserted material is underlined and deleted material has a line therethrough.

The applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowance of claim 21 which included the limitations of claims 1 and 13. The Examiner has consistently indicated that claim 13 contains allowable subject matter. The present amendment cancels dependent claim 13 and introduces the limitations of that claim into claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is now substantially the same as allowed claim 21.

Accordingly, it is believed that claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon (all remaining claims are dependent on claim 1) are now allowable. In the amendment prior to this amendment, claim 1 was amended to introduce the limitations of claims 14 and 15 and claims 14 and 15 were canceled. In the most recent Office Action the Examiner continued the rejection of claim 1 with the limitations of claims 14 and 15 included. The Examiner had indicated that claim 13 was allowable as dependent on claim 1 even without the amendment introducing the limitations of claims 14 and 15.

Accordingly the present amendment to claim 1 also removes the limitations of claims 14 and 15 added previously.

New claims 22 and 23 have been added to replace the previously canceled claims 14 and 15. Claims 22 and 23 are identical to previous claims 14 and 15. Claims 16-18 were previously dependent on claim 14 and the amendments above to those claims simply redirect the dependencies to claim 22 which is identical to and replaces canceled claim 14.

Independent claim 21, added as a new claim in the earlier response and intended to be an allowable version of claim 13, has been canceled as being duplicative of newly amended claim 1 (despite the allowance of claim 21). Careful examination of claim 21 determined that a typographical error had inadvertently introduced the same wording into that claim at two locations so that the limitations to the "surface cavity" and the "openings" therein were referenced twice in locations immediately adjacent at lines 14 16 and again at lines 16-18.

Instead of correcting these errors, claim 1 was amended to the same form as allowed claim 21 and claim 21 was canceled as being substantially identical in scope. The applicants regret the complexity of this amendment, which is fundamentally simple. Claim 1 has been amended to the form the Examiner has repeatedly allowed (as claim 21) or indicated to be allowable (as claim 13) and two canceled claims (14, 15) have been reinstated.

It is respectfully submitted that the application has now been brought into a condition where allowance of the case is proper. Reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


Anthony P. DeLio
Reg. No. 18,729

DeLIO & PETERSON, LLC
121 Whitney Avenue
New Haven, CT 06510-1241
(203) 787-0595